



**APPELLANTS' BRIEF ON APPEAL**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**RECEIVED**

NOV 04 2003

Technology Center 2100

1. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST .....	1
2. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES .....	2
3. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS .....	3
4. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS .....	3
5. SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION .....	3
6. ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW .....	4
7. GROUPING OF CLAIMS .....	4
8. ARGUMENT .....	5
9. SUMMARY .....	14
APPENDIX I—The Claims on Appeal .....	15

**PATENT**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of:	)	
	)	
Igor Sinyak et al.	)	Examiner: William L. Bashore
	)	
Serial No.: 09/371716	)	Group Art Unit: 2176
	)	
Filed: August 09, 1999	)	Docket: 884.006US2
	)	
For: DATA DISPLAY USING	)	
MULTICOLUMN		
SCROLLING		

---

**APPELLANTS' BRIEF ON APPEAL**

**RECEIVED**

NOV 04 2003

Technology Center 2100

Mail Stop Appeal Brief  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

**1. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The real party in interest of the above-captioned patent application is the assignee,  
INTEL CORPORATION.

**APPELLANTS' BRIEF ON APPEAL**

Serial Number: 09/371716

Filing Date: August 09, 1999

Title: DATA DISPLAY USING MULTICOLUMN SCROLLING

Assignee: Intel Corporation

---

**Page 2**

Dkt: 884.006US2 (INTEL)

**2. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

There are no other appeals or interferences known to Appellant which will have a bearing on the Board's decision in the present appeal.

**3. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

The present application was filed on August 9, 1999 as a Continuation of Application Serial Number 09/204,006 which was filed December 6, 1998. The present application was filed with claims 1-31. Claims 1, 6, 11-13, 18, 23-25, and 28-30 were amended following the first Office Action. Claims 1, 6-8, 11-13, 18-20, and 23-25 were amended following the Final Office Action, but the amendments were not entered. The rejected claims 1-31 are the subject of the present appeal.

**4. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

Claims 1, 6-8, 11-13, 18-20, and 23-25 were amended following the Final Office Action, but these amendments were not entered and are not subject to this appeal.

**5. SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION**

The inventive subject matter defined in the claims is directed to apparatuses, software, and methods for displaying line-formatted materials 20 in multiple columns 30, 32 of a screen display 10 and providing for scrolling through the materials 20 such that lines 20, 24 spill from one column 30, 32 to another, are disclosed. FIG. 3A and 3B and page 4, line 15 through page 5, line 31. The columns 30, 32 form a display area 14 for display of contiguous lines 22, 24 of the line-formatted materials 20, wherein diagonally opposite ends of the rightmost 32 and leftmost columns 30 define the starting and ending lines of the display area 10, such that when scrolling through line-formatted materials 20 the lines 22, 24 flow into and out of the display area 10 at the starting and ending lines. In another embodiment, Scripting language encoded line-formatted materials 20 are displayed under the control of a web browser 55 using the scrollable columns 30, 32. In another embodiment, line-formatted materials are encoded with one or more Scripting language codes that specify to a web browser 55 that the line-formatted materials 20 are to be displayed in scrollable columns 30, 32.

As used herein, the term "line-formatted materials" means any information which is organized as a sequence of lines to be displayed in a descending (or ascending) sequence on a screen display, wherein at least some of the lines are made up at least in part by discrete symbols, such as, but not limited to, alphanumeric characters or graphic icons or pictures. Furthermore, line-formatted materials may be displayed in conjunction with graphic elements that precede or follow the materials, or are displayed side by side therewith. For example, displayed text may wrap around a graphic element. Page 4, lines 7-14.

## **6. ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW**

1. Were claims 1-3, 5, 9, 13-15, 17, 25-26, 29, and 31 properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over WordPerfect 6.1 For Windows (released April 15, 1996 by Corel Corporation, screen shots from application, pp. 1-14)?
2. Were claims 4 and 16 properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over WordPerfect 6.1 For Windows (released April 15, 1996 by Corel Corporation, screen shots from application, pp. 1-14) and further in view of Edgar (U.S. Patent No. 6,113,394)?
3. Were claims 6-8, 10-12, 18-24, 27-28, and 30 properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Truong (U.S. Patent No. 6,151,609) in view of WordPerfect 6.1 For Windows (released April 15, 1996 by Corel Corporation, screen shots from application, pp. 1-14)?

## **7. GROUPING OF CLAIMS**

Although Appellant considers each pending claim to be separately patentable, and the claims do not stand or fall together, the rejections of the claims will be addressed in three groups to mirror the Examiner's rejections. These groups are as follows:

1. Claims 1-3, 5, 9, 13-15, 17, 25-26, 29, and 31
2. Claims 4 and 16
3. Claims 6-8, 10-12, 18-24, 27-28, and 30

## **8. ARGUMENT**

### **A) 35 USC § 103(a) Rejections**

#### **1) Applicable Law**

The Examiner has the burden under 35 U.S.C. § 103 to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1074, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). As part of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must show that some objective teaching in the prior art or some knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead an individual to combine the relevant teaching of the references. *Id.*

The court in *Fine* stated that:

Obviousness is tested by "what the combined teaching of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 425, 208 USPQ 871, 878 (CCPA 1981)). But it "cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching or suggestion supporting the combination." *ACS Hosp. Sys.*, 732 F.2d at 1577, 221 USPQ at 933. And "teachings of references can be combined *only* if there is some suggestion or incentive to do so."

*Id.* (emphasis in original).

The M.P.E.P. adopts this line of reasoning, stating that

"In order for the Examiner to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three base criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the

**APPELLANTS' BRIEF ON APPEAL**

Serial Number: 09/371716

Filing Date: August 09, 1999

Title: DATA DISPLAY USING MULTICOLUMN SCROLLING

Assignee: Intel Corporation

**Page 6**

Dkt: 884.006US2 (INTEL)

prior art, and not based on Appellant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed.Cir. 1991))". *M.P.E.P.* § 2142.

The test for obviousness under § 103 must take into consideration the invention as a whole; that is, one must consider the particular problem solved by the combination of elements that define the invention. *Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil*, 774 F.2d 1132, 1143, 227 USPQ 543, 551 (Fed. Cir. 1985). The Examiner must, as one of the inquiries pertinent to any obviousness inquiry under 35 U.S.C. § 103, recognize and consider not only the similarities but also the critical differences between the claimed invention and the prior art. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 834, 15 USPQ2d 1566, 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1990), *reh'g denied*, 1990 U.S. App. LEXIS 19971 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Further, the Office Action must provide specific, objective evidence of record for a finding of a suggestion or motivation to combine reference teachings and must explain the reasoning by which the evidence is deemed to support such a finding. *In re Sang Su Lee*, 277 F.3d 1338, 61 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 2002). Finally, the Examiner must avoid hindsight. *In re Bond* at 834.

**2) Discussion of the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 9, 13-15, 17, 25-26, 29, and 31 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over WordPerfect 6.1 For Windows (released April 15, 1996 by Corel Corporation, screen shots from application, pp. 1-14) (hereinafter "WordPerfect").**

Appellant respectfully submits that the Final Office Action did not make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness because WordPerfect does not teach each and every claim element arranged as in claims 1-3, 5, 9, 13-15, 17, 25-26, 29, and 31.

Claim 1 is rejected in the Final Office Action for four reasons. First, because WordPerfect includes "a customizable feature of applying line numbering to a file." Second, because the WordPerfect includes a "customizable feature of formatting two or more columns, causing text to flow down a column to the bottom of a page or column break, then start it again at

the top of the next column to the right.” Third, because WordPerfect discloses “scrolling from the bottom of one column, to the top of the adjacent column, as evidenced by cursor highlighting direction (or cursor down arrow scrolling).” Forth, applying these customizations as default settings within WordPerfect would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.” However, these reasons for rejection have mischaracterized the present invention and fail to recite every element of the claimed invention.

First, the Office Action asserts that there is capability in WordPerfect “of applying line numbering to a file” as evidence of “displaying line-formatted materials on a screen display” as claimed. Appellant respectfully traverses that assertion. The specification states on page 4, lines 7-14:

“As used herein, the term “line-formatted materials” means any information which is organized as a sequence of lines to be displayed in a descending (or ascending) sequence on a screen display, wherein at least some of the lines are made up at least in part by discrete symbols, such as, but not limited to, alphanumeric characters or graphic icons or pictures. Furthermore, line-formatted materials may be displayed in conjunction with graphic elements that precede or follow the materials, or are displayed side by side therewith. For example, displayed text may wrap around a graphic element.”

This definition is not limited to displaying line numbering as asserted in the Office Action.

Second, the Office Action asserts that there is capability in WordPerfect of a “customizable feature of formatting two or more columns, causing text to flow down a column to the bottom of a page or column break, then start it again at the top of the next column to the right,” as evidence of “lines spill from the bottom of the one column to the top of an adjacent column when scrolling through the line-formatted materials.” The Office Action fails to note that the spilling of text from one column to an adjacent column as claimed occurs when scrolling the text. The WordPerfect reference only discloses static text spanning static columns. The Examiner’s attention is drawn to Figures 3A, 3B, 4L, 4R, 5L, and 5R and specification page 4, numbered line 28 through page 5, numbered line 5 that recites:



“By scrolling the source code 20 “down,” line 22 and the four lines below it are moved off the top of the display area of column 30, five lines from the top of column 32 are moved to the bottom of column 30, and five new lines are added to the display area 14 at the bottom of column 32. Scrolling the source code 20 “up” produces the opposite effect. Thus, the line 36 at the top of column 32 is always the next sequential line following line 34 at the bottom of column 30. This operation can be defined as spilling lines from the bottom of column 30 to the top of column 32.”

The only potential spilling that is stated to occur in WordPerfect is related to the cursor, but claim 1 covers “lines of each column . . . spilling. . . .” Thus, WordPerfect does not disclose “. . . lines of each column are adjusted by spilling from the bottom of the one column to the top of an adjacent column.” as claimed in claim 1.

Third, the Office Action asserts that there is capability in WordPerfect of “scrolling from the bottom of one column, to the top of the adjacent column, “as evidenced by cursor highlighting direction (or cursor down arrow scrolling)” as evidence of “when scrolling through the line-formatted materials.” However, “when scrolling through the line-formatted materials” must be taken in context with the text immediately proceeding in the claim. This language cited in the Office Action from claim 1 with respect to this reason for rejection modifies the language immediately proceeding it and discussed in the above paragraph. Therefore, the scrolling as provided in WordPerfect is not the spilling of text scrolling as described in the specification or as claimed.

Fourth, the Office Action asserts that applying these customizations as default settings within WordPerfect would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. However, as discussed above, WordPerfect does not teach all the “customizations.” Therefore, the present invention cannot be considered obvious as asserted.

Therefore, because the reference does not teach or suggest all the claim elements as required by M.P.E.P. § 2142 (citing *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed.Cir. 1991)), Appellant respectfully submits that claim 1 is in allowable form. Claims 13 and 25 contain similar elements as claim 1 and are patentable over WordPerfect for similar reasons.

Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of independent claims 1, 13, and 25.

Claims 2-3, 5, 9, and 26; 14, 15, 17, and 29; and 31 depend directly from claims 1, 13, and 25 and are patentable over WordPerfect for the reasons argued above, plus the elements in the claims. Thus, Appellant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of dependent claims 2-3, 5, 9, and 26; 14, 15, 17, and 29; and 31.

**3) *Discussion of the rejection of claims 4 and 16 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over WordPerfect 6.1 For Windows (released April 15, 1996 by Corel Corporation, screen shots from application, pp. 1-14) (hereinafter "WordPerfect") and further in view of Edgar (U.S. Patent No. 6,113,394) (hereinafter "Edgar").***

Appellant respectfully submits that the Final Office Action did not make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness because it provides is no motivation to combine the references and even if combined, the combination of WordPerfect in further view of Edgar does not teach each and every claim element arranged as in claims 4 and 16. Claims 4 and 16 are further allowable because they depend directly from allowable independent claims.

The Office Action must provide specific, objective evidence of record for a finding of a suggestion or motivation to combine reference teachings and must explain the reasoning by which the evidence is deemed to support such a finding. *In re Sang Su Lee*, 277 F.3d 1338, 61 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 2002). The fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990); MPEP § 2143.01. The Office Action stated "It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the voice activation capability of Edgar to WordPerfect, providing WordPerfect the benefit of scrolling and various other functions adapted for the handicapped."

which is a mere conclusory statement of subjective belief. Appellant challenged the assert, asked for evidence pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 2144.03, and the examiner did not comply. Appellant respectfully submits that the Office Action has not provided objective evidence for a suggestion or motivation to combine the references.

However, even if the references are combined, the combination fails to teach or suggest every element of the claims. For example, Edgar is presented for the purposes of disclosing “a scrolling reading aid, said scrolling and other features subject to voice activations.” But Edgar does not cure the deficiencies of WordPerfect identified above in response to the 35 USC § 103(a) rejection of claim 1. Additionally, claims 4 and 16 directly depend from claims 1 and 13 respectively, which Appellant respectfully submits in allowable form. If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. MPEP § 2143.03.

Therefore, because there is no motivation to combine the references, because Edgar does not cure the deficiencies of WordPerfect and claims 4 and 16 depend directly on allowable claims, the rejections of claims 4 and 16 are not supported.

***4) Discussion of the rejection of claims 6-8, 10-12, 18-24, 27-28, and 30 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Truong (U.S. Patent No. 6,151,609) (hereinafter “Truong”) in view of WordPerfect 6.1 For Windows (released April 15, 1996 by Corel Corporation, screen shots from application, pp. 1-14) (hereinafter “WordPerfect”)***

Appellant respectfully submits that the Final Office Action did not make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness because there is no motivation to combine the references and even if combined, the combination of Truong in view of WordPerfect does not teach or suggest each and every claim element arranged as in claims 6-8, 10-12, 18-24, 27-28, and 30.

The Office Action must provide specific, objective evidence of record for a finding of a suggestion or motivation to combine reference teachings and must explain the reasoning by which the evidence is deemed to support such a finding. *In re Sang Su Lee*, 277 F.3d 1338, 61 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 2002). The fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990); MPEP § 2143.01. The Office Action asserts, "It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply WordPerfect's line numbering to Truong's source code editor window, providing Truong the benefit of keeping track of a large number of lines in a text source code as presented within Truong Figures 5-6." Page 8, lines 17-20. The Office Action makes nearly identical statements throughout pages 8-19. Appellant respectfully traverses these assertions as mere conclusory statements of subjective belief. Appellant respectfully submits that the Office Action has not provided objective evidence for a suggestion or motivation to combine the references.

Further, even if the reference are combined, they fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claims. For example, with regard to claim 6, Truong is presented for the purposes of disclosing a remote editor system utilizing the editing of various text sources within an Internet browser that provides scrolling bars and arrows along with specific editing functions. WordPerfect is presented for the purposes of disclosing the application line numbering and column formatting. However, the references when combined must teach or suggest all of the claim elements. Claim 6 as recites:

"A method comprising displaying Scripting language encoded line-formatted materials under the control of a web browser such that the line-formatted materials are displayed under control of the web browser in two or more adjacent columns of a screen display, wherein lines spill from the bottom of one column to the top of an adjacent column, or from the top of one column to the bottom of an adjacent column, when scrolling through the line-formatted materials."

In contrast, Truong relates to a remote editing system utilizing various text sources within an

Internet browser edit window that is directionally scrollable. (Truong Abstract, col. 3, lines 40-47; col. 7, lines 1-8; col. 9 lines 13-19; col. 10, lines 45-52). WordPerfect describes a text editor capable of editing various known text files and source code, applying line numbering to a document, and moving from page to page while scrolling. (WordPerfect ¶. 7-9) The references, if combined, do not teach or suggest “lines spill[ing] from the bottom of one column to the top of an adjacent column, or from the top of one column to the bottom of an adjacent column, when scrolling through the line-formatted materials” as disclosed in the present application and as set forth in claim 6. As stated above, the Office Action fails to note that the spilling of text from one column to an adjacent column as claimed occurs when scrolling the text. The WordPerfect reference only discloses static text spanning static columns. The Examiner’s attention is drawn to Figures 3A, 3B, 4L, 4R, 5L, and 5R and specification page 4, numbered line 28 through page 5, numbered line 5 that recites:

“By scrolling the source code 20 “down,” line 22 and the four lines below it are moved off the top of the display area of column 30, five lines from the top of column 32 are moved to the bottom of column 30, and five new lines are added to the display area 14 at the bottom of column 32. Scrolling the source code 20 “up” produces the opposite effect. Thus, the line 36 at the top of column 32 is always the next sequential line following line 34 at the bottom of column 30. This operation can be defined as spilling lines from the bottom of column 30 to the top of column 32.”

The only potential spilling that occurs in WordPerfect is related to the cursor, but claim 6 covers “lines spill[ing] from the bottom of one column to the top of an adjacent column, or from the top of one column to the bottom of an adjacent column, when scrolling through the line-formatted materials.”

Therefore, because there is no motivation to combine the references and because even if the references are combined the combination does not teach or suggest all the claim elements as required by M.P.E.P. § 2142 (citing *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed.Cir. 1991)), Appellant respectfully submits that claim 6 is in allowable form. Independent claims 11,

**APPELLANTS' BRIEF ON APPEAL**

Serial Number: 09/371716

Filing Date: August 09, 1999

Title: DATA DISPLAY USING MULTICOLUMN SCROLLING

Assignee: Intel Corporation

---

**Page 13**

Dkt: 884.006US2 (INTEL)

12, 18, 23, and 24 contain similar elements as claim 6 and are patentable over Truong in view of WordPerfect for similar reasons. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of independent claims 6, 11, 12, 18, 23, and 24.

Claims 7, 8, and 10; 27; 28; and 19-22 and 30 depend, directly or indirectly, on claims 6, 11, 12, and 18 and are patentable over Truong in view of WordPerfect for the reasons argued above, plus the elements in the claims. Thus, in view of the arguments with respect to independent claims 6, 11, 12, 18, 23, and 24, Appellant respectfully submits that claims 7, 8, and 10; 27; 28; and 19-22 and 30 are in condition for allowance.

**APPELLANTS' BRIEF ON APPEAL**

Serial Number: 09/371716

Filing Date: August 09, 1999

Title: DATA DISPLAY USING MULTICOLUMN SCROLLING

Assignee: Intel Corporation

**Page 14**

Dkt: 884.006US2 (INTEL)

**9. SUMMARY**

For the above reasons, claims 1-3, 5, 9, 13-15, 17, 25-26, 29, and 31 were not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over WordPerfect 6.1 For Windows.

For the above reasons, claims 4 and 16 were not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over WordPerfect 6.1 For Windows and further in view of Edgar.

In addition, claims 6-8, 10-12, 18-24, 27-28, and 30 were not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Truong in view of WordPerfect 6.1 For Windows.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection fails to state a claim of obviousness. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-31 should therefore be allowed. Reversal of the Examiner's rejections of claims 1-31 is respectfully requested. Should the Board be of the opinion that a rejected claim may be allowable in amended form, an explicit statement to that effect is also respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

IGOR SINYAK ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.

Attorneys for Intel Corporation

P.O. Box 2938

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

Date October 29, 2003 By Charles E. Steffey  
Charles E. Steffey  
Reg. No. 25,179

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8:** The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 29 day of October, 2003.

KACIA LEE  
Name

Kacia Lee  
Signature

## **APPENDIX I**

### **The Claims on Appeal**

1. A method comprising displaying line-formatted materials on a screen display in two or more adjacent columns, wherein lines spill from the bottom of one column to the top of an adjacent column, or from the top of one column to the bottom of an adjacent column, when scrolling through the line-formatted materials.
2. A method according to claim 1 wherein the screen display is at least in part under the control of a computing device with one or more keyboard keys, and at least one mode of scrolling through the line-formatted materials is accomplished under control of a single key.
3. A method according to claim 1 wherein the screen display is at least in part under the control of a computing device with a mouse input device, and at least one mode of scrolling through the line-formatted materials is accomplished under control of the mouse input device.
4. A method according to claim 1 wherein the screen display is at least in part under the control of a computing device with a microphone, and at least one mode of scrolling through the line-formatted materials is accomplished under control of a single voice command spoken to the microphone.
5. A method according to claim 1 wherein the columns form a display area for display of contiguous lines of the line-formatted materials, and wherein diagonally opposite ends of the rightmost and leftmost columns define the starting and ending lines of the display area, such that when scrolling through line-formatted materials the lines flow into and out of the display area at the starting and ending lines.



6. A method comprising displaying Scripting language encoded line-formatted materials under the control of a web browser such that the line-formatted materials are displayed under control of the web browser in two or more adjacent columns of a screen display, wherein lines spill from the bottom of one column to the top of an adjacent column, or from the top of one column to the bottom of an adjacent column, when scrolling through the line-formatted materials.
7. A method according to claim 6 wherein the Scripting language encoded line-formatted materials include Scripting language codes that instruct the browser to spill lines when scrolling.
8. A method according to claim 6 wherein the browser accomplishes the spilling of lines from one column to the other without instruction from Scripting language codes specifying such operation.
9. A method according to claim 1 wherein the line-formatted materials are source code.
10. A method according to claim 6 wherein the line-formatted materials are human readable text.
11. A method comprising encoding line-formatted materials to be displayed using a web browser with one or more Scripting language codes that specify to the web browser that the line-formatted materials are to be displayed in two or more adjacent columns, wherein lines spill from the bottom of one column to the top of an adjacent column, or from the top of one column to the bottom of an adjacent column, when scrolling through the line-formatted materials.

**APPELLANTS' BRIEF ON APPEAL**

Serial Number: 09/371716

Filing Date: August 09, 1999

Title: DATA DISPLAY USING MULTICOLUMN SCROLLING

Assignee: Intel Corporation

---

**Page 17**

Dkt: 884.006US2 (INTEL)

12. A machine readable document encoded in a carrier medium, wherein the document includes line-formatted materials and the materials are encoded with one or more Scripting language codes that specify to a web browser that the line-formatted materials are to be displayed in two or more adjacent columns, wherein lines spill from the bottom of one column to the top of an adjacent column, or from the top of one column to the bottom of an adjacent column, when scrolling through the line-formatted materials.

13. A program product comprising a computer program encoded in a <sup>Storage</sup>~~carrier~~ medium, the program code operative on a suitably configured computer to display line-formatted materials on a screen display in two or more adjacent columns, wherein lines spill from the bottom of one column to the top of an adjacent column, or from the top of one column to the bottom of an adjacent column, when scrolling through the line-formatted materials.

14. A product according to claim 13 wherein the program code is operative on the computer to scroll through the line-formatted materials under control of a single key providing input to the computer.

15. A product according to claim 13 wherein the program code is operative on the computer to scroll through the line-formatted materials under control of a mouse device providing input to the computer.

16. A product according to claim 13 wherein the program code is operative on the computer to scroll through the line-formatted materials under control of a voice command input to the computer.

17. A product according to claim 13 wherein the columns form a display area for display of contiguous lines of the line-formatted materials, and wherein diagonally opposite ends of the rightmost and leftmost columns define the starting and ending lines of the display area, such that when scrolling through line-formatted materials the lines flow into and out of the display area at the starting and ending lines.

18. A program product comprising a computer program encoded in a carrier medium, the program code operative on a suitably configured computer to display Scripting language encoded line-formatted materials such that the line-formatted materials are displayed in two or more adjacent columns of a screen display, wherein lines spill from the bottom of one column to the top of an adjacent column, or from the top of one column to the bottom of an adjacent column, when scrolling through the line-formatted materials.

19. A product according to claim 18 wherein the Scripting language encoded line-formatted materials include Scripting language codes that instruct the computer program to spill lines from column to column when scrolling.

20. A product according to claim 19 wherein the program accomplishes the spilling of lines from one column to the other without instruction from Scripting language codes specifying such operation.

21. A product according to claim 20 wherein the line-formatted materials are source code.

22. A product according to claim 20 wherein the line-formatted materials are human readable text.

23. A program product comprising line-based materials encoded in a carrier medium, line-formatted materials to be displayed using a web browser and encoded with one or more Scripting language codes that specify to a web browser that the line-formatted materials are to be displayed in two or more adjacent columns, wherein lines spill from the bottom of one column to the top of an adjacent column, or from the top of one column to the bottom of an adjacent column, when scrolling through the line-formatted materials.

24. A machine readable document encoded in a carrier medium, wherein the document includes line-formatted materials and the materials are encoded with one or more Scripting language codes that specify to a web browser that the line-formatted materials are to be displayed in two or more adjacent columns, wherein lines spill from the bottom of one column to the top of an adjacent column, or from the top of one column to the bottom of an adjacent column, when scrolling through the line-formatted materials.

25. A system comprising a computer programmed to display line-formatted materials on a computer screen display in two or more adjacent columns, wherein lines spill from the bottom of one column to the top of an adjacent column, or from the top of one column to the bottom of an adjacent column, when scrolling through the line-formatted materials.

26. A method according to claim 1 further wherein the line-formatted materials are displayed in conjunction with graphical elements.

27. A method according to claim 11 further wherein the line-formatted materials are displayed in conjunction with graphical elements.

**APPELLANTS' BRIEF ON APPEAL**

Serial Number: 09/371716

Filing Date: August 09, 1999

Title: DATA DISPLAY USING MULTICOLUMN SCROLLING

Assignee: Intel Corporation

---

**Page 20**

Dkt: 884.006US2 (INTEL)

28. The machine readable document according to claim 12 further wherein the line-formatted materials are displayed in conjunction with graphical elements.

29. The program product according to claim 13 further wherein the line-formatted materials are displayed in conjunction with graphical elements.

30. The program product according to claim 18 further wherein the line-formatted materials are displayed in conjunction with graphical elements.

31. A system according to claim 25 further wherein the line-formatted materials are displayed in conjunction with graphical elements.